REMARKS

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent bais for the claimed subject matter. In response, "in an omni-directional manner" has been replaced with "from all close vehicles" so that it corresponds to the specification as filed. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), as being anticipated under Price, et al., (U.S. 6,052,068) in view of Hawkles et al (US 5,973,643). The RF tag is passive, and not providing new information. Technologically speaking, since the invention is an RFID tag that is passive, it literally does not require any power and communicates uni-directionally with the patrol vehicle RF tag reader. Therefore, because it doesn't require a power source in the vehicle to be monitored, the present invention offers a distinct advantage over Price's invention, which contemplates using batteries in the vehicle's RF tag. The information provided by the RF tag is read only information that would normally be available to law enforcement personnel, as the tags would only have the license plate number, VIN number, vehicle make & model, and license plate expiration date, which does not raise privacy concerns as other cited inventions do. The invention's passive tag design, Omni-directional antenna, uni-directional communication between the vehicle RF tag and Patrol Vehicle RF tag reader optimize the invention's ability to process high-volume interrogations in real-time which is a requirement for highway traffic monitoring. Neither designs by Price, (US 6,408,232 B1) or Hawkles

support high-traffic / high-speed, Omni-directional RF tag interrogation, and unidirectional communication between the vehicle RF tag and patrol vehicle RF tag reader. A fingerprint ID is also available, but no further information is included, and this aspect of the present invention is important because it does not raise privacy concerns as do some cited patents. Additionally, the present invention is fully operable when only one RF tag is placed on a vehicle to be monitored. By contrast, Price's invention uses a plurality of RF tags on vehicles to be monitored, and thereby exposes itself to various problems. For example, because Price's invention picks the RF tag with the strongest signal to use for communication with the RF tag reader, and provides for data to be written onto RF tags, it requires (yet does not detail) a method for updating the RF tags that were not directly modified. The present invention eliminates the need for providing a means of communication between a vehicle's RF tags, and therefore solves the problems of inconsistent data appearing on RF tags, of unintended communications between one vehicle's RF tags and those of another vehicle, and of error inherent in RF communication. Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 2-10 are dependent on currently amended claim 1 (which states the further limitations of the RF tag) that they are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 11-14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Price (U.S. 6,052,068) and Hawkles et al (US 5,973,643) in view of Cannon et al (U.S. 6,408,232). The applicant respectfully submits that as claims 11-14 are ultimately dependent on newly amended claim 1 that they are now allowable. Claims 16 and 17 have also been amended to specify the limitations of the RFID tag and therefore Applicant believes they are allowable. No new matter has been entered.

A petition for an extension of time is hereby made. Please charge all fees due and owing to deposit account number 500356 in the name of Greenberg & Lieberman.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Greenberg, Esq.

Reg. No. 47312

I hereby certify that this amendment and response was mailed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 25, 2006.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Greenberg, Esq.

Reg. No. 47312